

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-6 and 8- 13 are pending. By this response, claims 1, 8, 12 and 13 are amended. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4-6 and 8-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertrand (US 5,552,989) in view of Bormans (US 5,325,482) and Kuchenrither, et al. (US 5,519,609). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In embodiments of the present invention data from a map corresponding to a selected year is displayed with map data from a different year which maybe current map data. Specific data on the map of a specific area is specified to be emphasized when displayed. The specific data may include specific types of buildings, roads, etc. Only the specified data is emphasized. The map data from the selected year and the different year is then superposed creating on the display what is viewed as a single map. In this superposed map, the emphasized data from the specific year map data maintains its emphasis while the rest of the data from the specific year map data and from the different map data is displayed in a normal non-emphasis manner.

In another embodiment of the present invention, the specific year map data and different map data are displayed on the same display, but in different areas on the display.

The Office Action alleges that Bormans provides the teachings of emphasizing map data, superposing map data and displaying map data as in the embodiments of the present invention and recited in independent claims 1, 8, 12 and 13. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Bormans teaches a device which allows for digitizing original paper maps (non-digital) and storing them for comparison with new data maps. As seen from Fig. 1, the non-digital map

3, referred to as old map, is digitized by a digitizing device 1 and movable member 2. Once digitized, the old map and a new map can be simultaneously displayed on top of each other on the display means 5. The old and new maps are differentiated by each being displayed in a different color. The map data is compared in relation to fix points and reference points on the new map and old map data. The old map data is updated by converting it to a new topographical map. See column 2, lines 4-20.

The Examiner alleges that the use of different colors teaches applicant's claimed emphasis of specified data. Applicant disagrees. In Bormans system, all of the new map data and all of the old map data are colored, albeit the new map data a first color and the old map data a second color. Specific data within the map is not specified for emphasis since all of the data is colored in Bormans teachings.

Also, the Examiner alleges that Bormans teaches the superposing of the map data. Applicant submits that Bormans teaches simultaneously displaying by overlaying on each other old and new map data. Particular data is not emphasized in this overlay as each map data contains a specific color corresponding to the old and new data. Further, once the old map data is converted, there is no teaching that specified data is emphasized. Thus, Bormans does not teach where the superposed map data includes emphasized data from the specific year map data and normal data from the different year map data.

Further, the Examiner alleges that simultaneous displaying of the old and new map data corresponds to applicant's claimed displaying map data of a specific year in a first display area and map data of a different year in a second display area where the first and second display areas are different on the display. Applicant submits that Bormans teaches a display which displays all

the new map data simultaneously but overlapping each other and not in separate display areas on the display. In fact, nowhere does Bormans teach separate display areas.

Thus, Bormans fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, specifying a specific year of the map data to be displayed and specifying specific data items from the map data that is to be emphasized when displayed, as recited in claims 1 and 12; wherein the superposed map data, includes at least one of said emphasized data items specified by said specifying means from a specific year and normal data items from the different year, as recited in claim 1, and wherein the superposed map data, includes at least one of said emphasized data items which is specified from said specific year and normal data items from said different year and responding to superposed map data, as recited in claim 12.

Bormans also fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, displaying means for displaying the edited map data of a specific year in a first display area, and the edited map data of a different year in a second display area different from said first display area at the same time, as recited in claim 8 and wherein the edited map data of a specific year is displayed in a first display area, and the edited map data of a different year is displayed in a second display area different from said first display area at the same time, as recited in claim 13.

Further, the Office Action as stated that Bertrand and Kuchenrither fails to teach the features for which Bormans is provided to teach. Therefore, Bertrand and Kuchenrither fail to remedy the deficiencies of Bormans.

Thus, in view of the above, applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Bertrand, Bormans and Kuchenrither fail to teach each and every feature of independent claims

1, 8, 12 and 13 as required. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 2, 4-6 and 8-13 are distinguishable over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings (Reg. No. 48,917) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: July 5, 2006

Respectfully submitted,
By _____

D. Richard Anderson
Registration No.: 40,439
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant